UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,409	01/03/2002	Michael Allen Yudkowsky	42390p13063	7057

8791   7590   12/01/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER
ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 January 2002_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _2_ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-12 and 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goronzy

   et al (EP 1022725 A1).

   Goronzy discloses a system for the selection of acoustic models using speaker

verification.

2. Regarding claim 1, Goronzy discloses determining an identity of a speaker through a network

   over which output data, regarding a person with access to a speech-recognition system

   receiving the output data, is provided to one or more speech-recognition systems, at col. 3,

   lines 35-37; attempting to locate, based on the identity of the speaker, a voice model for

   speaker, at col. 3, lines 53-58; and retrieving from a storage area the voice model for the

   speaker if the voice model for the speaker is located, at col. 3, line 53 continuing to col. 4,

   line 2.

   Regarding claim 2, Goronzy discloses the voice model comprises a speaker dependent

voice model at col. 3, line 53 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

   Regarding claim 3, Goronzy discloses wherein determining the identity of the speaker

over the network comprises using information received from the speaker over the network to

determine the identity of the speaker, at col. 3, line 39 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 4, Goronzy discloses receiving from a device in the network identifying data regarding the speaker, at col. 3, line 39 continuing to col. 4, line 2; determining the identity of the speaker based on the identifying data regarding the speaker, at col. 3, line 39 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 5, Goronzy discloses wherein the storage area comprises an internal storage area containing speaker-dependent voice models for multiple persons, at col. 3, line 58 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 6, Goronzy discloses wherein the storage area comprises an external storage area accessible over the network, at col. 3, line 58 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 7, Goronzy discloses wherein the output data comprise phonemes, at col. 3, line 39.

Regarding claim 8, Goronzy discloses receiving an utterance from the speaker at col. 3, lines 39-43; using the voice model to extract phonemes from the utterance at col. 3, lines 39-52; and transmitting the phonemes over the network to the speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 39-43.

Regarding claim 9, Goronzy discloses wherein the utterance comprises one or both of the vocalized words and vocalized sounds, at col. 3, lines 39-43.

Regarding claim 10, Goronzy discloses receiving from the speech recognition system contents of a recognized utterance of the speaker, at col. 3, lines 43-58; revising the voice model for the speaker based on the contents of the recognized utterance, at col. 3, lines 53-58; col. 4, lines 30-40.

Regarding claim 11, Goronzy discloses wherein the output data comprise a voice model

for the speaker, at col. 3, lines 53-58; col. 4, lines 30-40.

Regarding claim 12, Goronzy discloses further comprising transmitting the voice model

over the network to the speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 53-58.

Regarding claim 14, Goronzy discloses retrieving a speaker-independent voice model if

failing to locate the voice model for the speaker, at col. 4, lines 30-40; receiving an utterance

from the speaker, at col. 4, lines 19-21; using the speaker-independent voice model to extract

phonemes from the utterance, at col. 3, lines 53-58; transmitting the phonemes over the network

to a speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 43-52; receiving from the speech-recognition

system contents of a recognized utterance of the speaker, at col. 3, lines 46-58 and col. 4, lines

17-40; and generating a voice model for the speaker based on the contents of the recognized

utterance, at col. 4, lines 17-40.

Regarding claims 15-30, claims 15-30 are similar in scope and content to claims 1-12 and

14 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goronzy in view of

Ellis et al, "Tandem Acoustic Modeling in Large Vocabulary Recognition", (ICASSP '01).

2001 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2001

Proceedings, vol. 1, pages 517-520.

4. Regarding claim 13, Goronzy does not specifically teach implementation of Aurora feature

extraction. However, implementation of Aurora features was well known in the art.

In a similar field of endeavor, Ellis teaches a system of tandem acoustic modeling in a

large vocabulary recognition system, and specifically describes the advantages of using Aurora

data in a recognition system since the system involves recognizing data in a wide range of noisy

backgrounds.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention

to modify the system of Goronzy to implement Aurora feature processing, for the purpose of

providing a recognition system that is able to recognize data in noisy backgrounds, as taught by

Ellis.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Kanevsky et al (US Patent No. 6,442,519) discloses a speech recognition system, which

provides for speaker model adaptation via a network of similar users.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

                                                    Angela A. Armstrong
                                                    Examiner
                                                    Art Unit 2654

AAA

November 25, 2003

                              RICHEMOND DORVIL
                              SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER